RAB Minutes

NAS North Island

Restoration Advisory Board

Introduction

The fifty-ninth Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting for Naval Air Station (NAS) North Island/Naval Amphibious Base (NAB) Coronado was held on Thursday, September 16, 1999, at the Coronado Public Library from 6:30 p.m. to 7:50 p.m. Mr. Collins called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m., and welcomed RAB members and the public.

RAB Attendance

Bill Collins, John Locke, Richard Mach, Foster Marshall, Bob Geilenfeldt

Public/Navy Attendance

Rick Basinet, Mark Bonsavage, Ken Branch, Stephen Dirtadian, Marilyn Field, Scott Haley, Janet Lear, Nancy Lee, Bob Logan, Jorge Matos, Scott Morris, Rick Phillips, David Rodriquez, Debbie Wankier

Approval of August 11, 1999 Meeting Minutes

The August 11, 1999 meeting minutes were approved.

Meeting Topics

The August 1999 meeting topics were the Site 9 Soil Vapor Extraction with Steam Injection and Free Product Recovery Update, Site 1 Confined Disposal Facility Monitoring Presentation, Operable Units 19 and 20 Soil and Groundwater Investigation Update, and RAB Membership Drive and Conducting Business Update.

Presentations

Site 9 Soil Vapor Extraction with Steam Injection and Free Product Recovery Update — Richard Mach, SWDIV RPM and Scott Haley, OHM

The first presentation was on Site 9, the soil vapor extraction with steam injection and free product recovery update. Mr. Mach gave a brief project overview, recapping the project status presented at previous RAB meetings.

Mr. Haley gave details as to what has been done so far and where the project is going. Mr. Haley stated that construction for the pilot test has been completed, and the 24-hour operation of the pilot test out at Site 9, Area 1 has started; which included soil vapor extraction, steam injection, and free product recovery with skimmer pumps. To date, the skimmer pumps have removed approximately 75 gallons of free product. The amount of free product that has been collected should increase by heating up the subsurface and getting temperature gradients between the positive pressure steam that's being injected and the vacuum that's being induced by the soil vapor extraction system.

The pilot test is expected to continue through October 1999 and, during that time, a lot of data will be collected. Soil vapor samples are being collected to test what chemicals are volatilizing; and at the end of this pilot test, the data collected will be used for the final design. The design of the site should be finalized about November or December 1999, and construction beginning in about the

beginning of the year 2000.

A question was raised concerning the review of the final design. Mr. Mach addressed the concern by explaining that the purpose of this pilot test was not to determine whether the steam injection was going to work, but rather was to get the parameters needed to optimize the well spacing and operating parameters (pressure, temperature, vacuum, etc.) to install the best system for the lowest cost.

Site 1 Confined Disposal Facility Monitoring Presentation — Janet Lear, and Davis Rodriquez, *Bechtel*

The next presentation was given by Ms. Lear on the Site 1 Confined Disposal Facility Investigation. All of Site 1 was identified as an Installation Restoration (IR) site in 1983 due to historical discharges of industrial waste from the storm drain system. In 1995, the Navy issued an Action Memorandum regarding the Time Critical Removal Action for Outfalls 9-15 within Site 1, which took into account the construction project for the CVN (carrier) Homeporting. The construction project consisted of dredging the turning basin and approach (the bay areas where the carriers turn and park), and constructing approximately a 13-acre fill area behind a rock dike.

This fill area then is known as the Compliance Disposal Facility (CDF). Prior to this time, there were several studies done in this area to evaluate the concentrations of contaminants that were in the sediments offshore at these outfalls. Some of the chemicals that were identified included metals, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs). Many of the sample locations are either within the CDF footprint or in the footing of the CDF where this material was dredged out, as well as in the larger area of dredge removal for the turning basin. As a result, the majority of the concentrations detected during the previous investigation are now inside this CDF containment area.

In the construction, the dredged-fill sediments were placed on top of the Site 1 sediments and then were covered with 10 to 14 feet of clean fill. In addition, there's a 50-foot buffer zone of clean fill between the rock dike wall and these dredged-fill sediments.

The purpose of this project was to evaluate whether any contaminants in the Site 1 sediments and/or the dredged-fill sediments could potentially leach into the groundwater and travel into the bay, creating a potential risk to human health and/or the environment.

To evaluate this, 15 wells were installed in and around the CDF area which included: 10 compliance wells, which were along the edge between the dredged-fill sediments and the bay, three upgradient wells, and two wells located in the interior of the CDF. These wells have been monitored for three-quarters for a variety of constituents. The project threshold levels are the lowest or most conservative of National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for saltwater aquatic life or human health protection, and/or the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Applied Action Levels. Any exceedences of those project threshold levels would trigger the next phase of the investigation, which is the performance of risk assessments for both ecological and human health.

There were only a very few contaminants, which were detected above the screening thresholds. These included copper, zinc, arsenic, nickel, and PAHs. Most of these contaminants were also detected in the background wells indicating that many of these detections may be attributed to naturally occurring background conditions. All of these contaminants will be further assessed as well as the background conditions in the area.

Trichloroethene (TCE) was also found in concentrations exceeding project threshold levels in two

compliance wells at the CDF. There is an upgradient TCE plume in this area, which is more than likely where the exceedences are coming from in the CDF wells.

The tasks remaining on this project are to evaluate the fourth quarter data, perform ecological and human health risk assessments, using the results of the monitoring data, and prepare the Remedial Investigation (RI) report. The monitoring at the CDF wells will continue on a quarterly basis for at least another year.

Ms. Field asked, *"Does this mean that the CDF is not functioning as it's supposed to, the fact that you have gotten these contaminants up to these wells?"*

Mr. Mach answered, *"We will continue to monitor it and verify that nothing changes over time; however, what they're showing right now is that you can't detect anything above background in the CDF or downgradient of the CDF. So it's not leaching through, and it's all consistent with what's upgradient."*

Operable Units 19 and 20 Soil and Groundwater Investigation Update — Richard Mach, *SWDIV RPM* and Scott Morris, *OHM*

Mr. Mach presented an overview of this project, which he presented several meetings back. He then introduced Mr. Morris to present the latest investigation results.

Mr. Morris presented the latest findings of the Operable Units 19 and 20 Soil and Groundwater Investigation. It was discovered that the groundwater was contaminated in Building 379, which is the Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP) area. An innovative sampling technique was used that pushes a rod and sample probe down into the ground, and collects samples at various depths as it goes down. It appears from all the data collected, that the initial groundwater plume has been delineated and a second plume source has been detected.

It has been proposed to address the two plumes separately, with the new plume being investigated in the future, and the old plume proceeding with remediation now. As soon as the confirmation groundwater monitoring wells are installed and sampled, the data will be submitted to the Water Board and DTSC. The additional health risk assessment can then be completed for the site, as well as any additional wells that might be needed to complete the delineation of this piece of the plume, and then write the RI report and continue on with the removal actions.

Mr. Mach stated two removal actions would likely be needed some time in the near future for the initial plume area. They may be performed at the same time, but they're two different technologies. One is in the source area in the groundwater. The action will probably be some sort of chemical oxidation, injection of a chemical, which is going to essentially break down the TCE and other chlorinated compounds to Carbon dioxide and water. The second is to address the free product, which is floating on the water table. The Navy is waiting to see the results of the Site 9 pilot test before proceeding with a similar technology at this site.

Ms Field asked, *"That steam injection system, what does that do?"*

Mr. Mach answered, *"Steam injection does several things: One is it heats up the free product—the petroleum in the subsurface, and that does a couple of things; one, most of these chlorinated solvents once they're heated, they're going to volatilize. They're going to bubble out of the product. And when you've got that soil vapor extraction system in there sucking off those vapors from the soil, it's going to suck all those chlorinated solvents out that are heated up."*

"The second thing is when it heats up the petroleum that is floating there on the water table—it makes it much more mobile. It will flow. If you take molasses and you heat it up, it flows better. Same thing with the product. By heating it up, we can get the petroleum out of wells faster and we can suck it out of the ground in that form. So that's what the steam does for us."

RAB Membership Drive and Conducting Business Update — Carla Fargo and Foster Marshall

RAB Membership Drive

It was decided at last months meeting, Mr. Locke and Ms. Fargo would work together to determine advertisement ideas for the RAB membership drive. Mr. Locke stated he spoke with Ms. Raun, from the *"Coronado Eagle,"* and that she would like to do a feature story on the RAB, and also that she will be attending the October RAB meeting. Mr. Locke indicated that Ms. Raun, Ms. Fargo, and he would be discussing the content for the article to be written. He also mentioned that no advertisements or other methods had been done at this time to stimulate new members to join the RAB.

As for other methods to get the word out to the public, Mr. Geilenfeldt informed RAB members that City HallMr. Marshall suggested keeping meeting presentations simple, and presenting at a third-grade level. He feels the meetings are slowed down by excessive use of jargon. However, Mr. Collins commented that in the past, RAB members thought presentations and training should be kept at a higher level, causing the RAB to learn, and their knowledge to be brought up to a higher level. Although, at that same night another person in the public participation, DTSC, said no, that it should be brought back down again. It was then suggested to bring it to at least a 7th or 8th grade level, and not keep it at a high school or first two years of college level. There's a difference in the viewpoint of where it ought to be. It was noted, if it's too difficult to understand at the current level, then an effort could be made to bring it down so that the information presented would be easier to understand. Lowering the level was thought to help, and perhaps get more members as a result.

Mr. Mach offered to provide a summation/evaluation form at the RAB meetings to critique the presenters on their performance. He stated it was important that everyone understands the topics. Mr. Collins offered to draft up the form to evaluate the meetings, and that it will be brought to the October meeting. posted a notice on the entry door at the clerk's office, and Mr. Collins suggested posting notices in hotels, motels, and stores as done in the past.

Conducting Business Update

The next issue was how to conduct business, and how to proceed with questions during RAB meetings.

Keeping it Simple, or Not?

Public Questions and Comments

Future Training Topics

Carcinogenic

Mr. Geilenfeldt suggested to Mr. Marshall, to present a class on what he's learned—Mr. Collins agreed.

Both Mr. Marshall and Mr. Geilenfeldt, shared the concern of Carcinogenic, (specifically the data of Coronado resident's cancer-related cases -or- lack of any abnormal cancer-related cases).

Relative Risk

Michael Pound will be giving a presentation about the relative risk, at the October 21st meeting.

Upcoming Agenda Items

Ranking of all sites and Department of Defense (DOD) sites

The ranking process of all Navy sites and all DOD sites, how the Navy's sites rank up against all the other sites in the DOD, and how the Navy gets its funding will be presented at the next meeting by Mr. Pound. Mr. Collins will follow-up with what the Navy's fiscal year 2000 budget is going to be, and the projects that are planned to be awarded next year.

Water Board, Groundwater

Mr. Cheng, from the Water Board, has been invited to give a presentation on groundwater in general as well as how our particular groundwater acts. Mr. Cheng gave a presentation to the RAB approximately three years ago, and has been asked to come back and do a similar presentation. Mr. Cheng has tentatively confirmed the December 1st meeting.

Innovative Technology

And lastly, the other presentation, which was discussed, was to get an Innovative Technology presentation of about 30-minutes on one technology. Chemical oxidation, which was discussed for both Site 5 and for Operable Units 19 and 20, would be a good technology to present. This may be a topic for the January meeting.

Site-Walk

Several RAB members and the public requested a site-walk to visit the various sites, and to observe the technologies being used at the sites. It was suggested to make it an agenda topic for the October RAB meeting.

RAB Upcoming Meetings, Year 1999

Thursday, October 21, 1999

Wednesday, December 1, 1999

RAB Upcoming Meetings, Year 2000

January 20th; February 17th; March 16; April 20th; May 18th, June 15th; No meeting in July; August 17th; September 21st; October 19th; November 16th; and, No meeting in December.

Meeting Adjourned

Mr. Collins concluded the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.